



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,694	06/13/2001	Richard McGrath	G04.007	4297
28062	7590	12/12/2005	EXAMINER	
BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC			WONG, LESLIE	
5 ELM STREET			ART UNIT	
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			PAPER NUMBER	
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,694

Applicant(s)

MCGRATH ET AL.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendments, submitted on 28 September 2005, overcome the 101 rejection. Examiner hereby withdrawn the rejection that was given in the Office Action dated 20 June 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2164

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Weissman et al.** ("Weissman") in view of **Thompson et al.** ("Thompson") (US 6668253 B1).

Regarding claim 1, **Weissman** teaches a method of aggregating and maintaining data in a system having at least a first and a second platform generating data, comprising:

- a). receiving initial data from said first (i.e., source system) and said second platforms (i.e., staging table) (col. 8, lines 49-52; col. 11, lines 11-21; Fig.1, element 110).
- b). generating, using a computer, a staging table to store said initial data (col. 8, lines 49-57; col. 10, lines 46-52; Fig. 1, element 130); and
- c). associating standardized data with said initial data using said computer (col. 9, lines 3-12; col. 11, lines 18-21).

Weissman does not explicitly teach track changes, additions, and rejections of said initial data.

Thompson, however, teaches a staging table that track changes, additions, and rejections of said initial data as once the data has been loaded (i.e., add data) into the staging tables, a second phase of validations and cleansing is performed. At any time during the transformation and cleansing process an error occurs, the row of data with the error is written to an error table along with an error message describing the reason for rejection. The Data Warehouse can be refreshed on a regular basis. However, most require a massive conversion where data is cleansed and transformed, followed

Art Unit: 2164

by periodic updates of data modified in the operational source systems. Theses incremental changes must also be cleansed and transformed prior to updating the Data Warehouse (col. 21, lines 16-30; col. 21, lines 59-66 and Fig. 9 and Fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Thompson's** teaching would have allowed **Weissman's** to properly represent the business at hand and thus produce accurate results based on the queries used to analyzed the business environment as suggested by **Thompson** at col. 21, lines 12-16.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, **Weissman** further teaches associating includes generating a cross-reference table correlating said standardized data with initial data from said first platform and correlating said standardized data with said initial data form said second platform (col. 16, line 59 – col. 17, line 2; col. 8, line 28 – col. 9, line 40).

Regarding claim 3, **Weissman** further teaches receiving updated data from said first and said second platforms (col. 20, lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 4, **Weissman** further teaches comparing said updated data with data in said staging table (col. 20, lines 44-46; col. 20 lines 8-26).

Regarding claims 5 and 7, **Weissman** further teaches determining if said updated data includes new data (col. 8, line 28 – col. 9, line 40; col. 20, lines 44-46).

Regarding claims 6, 10, and 11 **Weissman** further teaches the steps of:

- a). setting a flag in said staging table (col. 13, lines 24-28);
- b). comparing said updated data with said standardized data (col. 19, lines 8-25);
- c). determining if said standardized data should be updated to reflect said updated (col. 13, line 25 – col. 14, line 5; col. 19, lines 8-25)

Regarding claim 12, **Weissman** further teaches notifying said platform that said updated data has been rejected (col. 10-13).

Claims 13-20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-12.

Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHARLES RONES can be reached on (571)272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2164

LW
December 6, 2005